arXiv:1603.08706v1 [math.FA] 29 Mar 2016

A BOURGAIN-LIKE PROPERTY OF BANACH SPACES WITH NO COPIES OF c_0

A. PÉREZ AND M. RAJA

ABSTRACT. We give a characterization of the existence of copies of c_0 in Banach spaces in terms of indexes. As an application, we deduce new proofs of James Distortion theorem and Bessaga-Pełczynski theorem about weakly unconditionally Cauchy series.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to study the existence of copies of c_0 in Banach spaces in terms of indexes and by purely geometrical methods. Our motivation for this is the beautiful characterization given by Bourgain [1, Lemma 3.7, p. 39] of Banach spaces not containing ℓ^1, as those satisfying that for every bounded subset C of X^* and each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist relatively weak*-open subsets $U_1, \ldots, U_m$ of C such that $\frac{1}{m}(U_1 + \ldots + U_m)$ has diameter less than ε. Several results concerning this type of spaces follow from this, like the fact that their dual unit ball (B_{X^*}, ω^*) is convex block compact [1, Proposition 3.11, p. 43].

We prove that a Banach space X does not contain an isomorphic copy of c_0 if and only if for every bounded subset A of X and each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ in A such that $\bigcap_{j=1}^m (A - x_j) \cap (x_j - A)$ has diameter less than ε. Actually, we give a quantitative version of this fact. We first associate to any bounded set $A \subset X$ a sequence of indexes $\delta_m(A)$ ($m \geq 0$), being $\delta_m(A)$ half of the infimum of all diameters of sets $\bigcap_{j=1}^m (A - x_j) \cap (x_j - A)$ where $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in A$. Then, we prove in Theorem 2.5 that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the absolute convex hull of A such that

$$(\delta_{2^N}(A) - \varepsilon) \cdot \max_{1\leq n\leq N} |\lambda_n| \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n x_n \right\| \leq \delta_0(A) \cdot \max_{1\leq n\leq N} |\lambda_n| \tag{1}$$

for every $\lambda_1, \ldots \lambda_N \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

From the previous result we deduce the characterization of Banach spaces containing an isomorphic copy of c_0 mentioned above (Theorem 3.1), as well as the known theorems of James (Theorem 3.2) and Bessaga-Pełczynski (Theorem 3.3) without using basic sequences.

Our notation is standard and follows [5]. We denote by X a real Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|$. Its topological dual will be denoted by X^*, and for any $x^* \in X^*$ and $x \in X$ the evaluation of x^* at x is written as $x^*(x) = \langle x^*, x\rangle = \langle x, x^*\rangle$. The closed

A. Pérez and M. Raja are partially supported by the MINECO/FEDER project MTM2014-57838-C2-1-P. The first author is also supported by a PhD fellowship of La Caixa Foundation.

unit ball (resp. unit sphere) of X is denoted by B_X (resp. S_X). If $D \subset X$ then we write $\operatorname{co}(D)$, $\operatorname{aco}(D)$ and $\operatorname{span}(D)$ to denote the convex hull, the absolutely convex hull and the linear hull of D. The supremum of $x^* \in X$ on D is denoted by $\sup(x^*, D)$. A *slice* of D is a set of the form $S(D, x^*, \delta) := \{x \in D : x^*(x) > \sup(x^*, D) - \delta\}$ for some $x^* \in X^*$ and $\delta > 0$. Recall that the *diameter* of D is defined as $\operatorname{diam}(D) := \sup\{\|x-y\| : x, y \in D\}$.

2. Indexes of symmetrization

Definition 2.1. *Given $A \subset X$ bounded, the symmetrized of A with respect to $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in A$ is defined as $\bigcap_{n=1}^N (A - x_n) \cap (x_n - A)$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we also define:*

$$\Delta_N(A) := \left\{ \bigcap_{n=1}^N (A - x_n) \cap (x_n - A) : x_1, \ldots, x_N \in A \right\}.$$
$$\delta_0(A) := \operatorname{diam}(A)/2, \quad \delta_N(A) := \inf\{\delta_0(D) : D \in \Delta_N(A)\}.$$

It is clear from the definition that $\{\Delta_N(A) : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an increasing sequence of sets, and hence $\{\delta_N(A) : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is decreasing. We will write $\delta_\infty(A) := \lim_N \delta_N(A)$. Let us point out that if $x \in A$, then $d \in (A - x) \cap (x - A)$ is equivalent to $x \pm d \in A$. With this in mind, the following (useful) observations are direct:

(I) If $D \in \Delta_N(A)$ is the symmetrized of A with respect to $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in A$, then for every $d \in D$ the set $(D - d) \cap (d - D)$ is the symmetrized of A with respect to $x_1 \pm d, \ldots, x_N \pm d \in A$. In particular, $(D-d) \cap (d-D) \in \Delta_{2N}(A)$.

(II) Given $x^* \in X^*$, $\delta > 0$ and $x \in S(A, x^*, \delta)$, every $d \in D := (A - x) \cap (x - A)$ satisfies $|x^*(x)| + |x^*(d)| < \sup(x^*, A)$, so that $|x^*(d)| < \delta$. In particular, $x \pm D \subset S(A, x^*, 2\delta)$.

Recall that the *Kuratowski measure of non-compactness* of a set $S \subset X$ is

$$\alpha(S) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{ there are finitely many balls of radius } \varepsilon \text{ which cover } S\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *If $A \subset X$ is bounded and $D \in \Delta_N(A)$, then $\alpha(D) \geq \delta_{2N}(A)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha(D) < \varepsilon$, and let $D_1, \ldots, D_n$ be a finite family of subsets of D whose union is equal to D and such that each D_k is contained in a ball of radius less than ε. If $D \subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}(D_1)$, then $\operatorname{diam}(D) < 2\varepsilon$ and so $\delta_{2N}(A) \leq \delta_N(A) \leq \delta_0(D) < \varepsilon$. Otherwise, we can assume that there is $2 \leq m \leq n$ such that

$$D \subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}(D_1 \cup \ldots \cup D_m) \quad \text{and} \quad D \not\subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}(D_1 \cup \ldots \cup D_{m-1}). \tag{2}$$

We can take $x_0^* \in S_{X^*}$ and $\delta > 0$ such that the slice $S(D, x_0^*, \delta)$ has empty intersection with $\overline{\operatorname{co}}(B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{m-1})$. We claim that for every $0 < \eta < 1$ it holds that

$$S(D, x_0^*, \eta\delta) \subset D_m + \eta(1 + \operatorname{diam} D) B_X. \tag{3}$$

If $d \in S(D, x_0^*, \eta\delta)$, then by (2) we can find $d' := \lambda d_m + (1-\lambda) c_m$ where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $d_m \in D_m$ and $c_m \in \operatorname{co}(D_1 \cup \ldots \cup D_{m-1})$ such that $\|d - d'\| < \eta$ and $d' \in S(D, x_0^*, \delta\eta)$. Since $x_0^*(c_m) \leq \sup(x_0^*) - \delta$, we deduce that

$$\sup(x_0^*, D) - \eta\delta < x_0^*(d') = \lambda x_0^*(d_m) + (1-\lambda) x_0^*(c_m) \leq \sup(x_0^*, D) - (1-\lambda)\delta.$$

This yields $1 - \lambda < \eta$, and so

$$\|d - d_m\| \leq \|d - d'\| + \|d' - d_m\| < \eta + (1-\lambda)\|d_m - c_m\| < \eta(1 + \operatorname{diam} D).$$

This proves the claim. By observations (I) and (II), for every $d_0 \in S(D, x_0^*, \eta\delta/2)$ the set $D_0 := (D - d_0) \cap (d_0 - D)$ belongs to $\Delta_{2N}(A)$ and $d_0 \pm D_0 \subset S(D, x_0^*, \eta\delta)$. Hence, we get by (3) that

$$\delta_{2N}(A) \leq \delta_0(D_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{diam} S(D, x_0^*, \eta\delta) \leq \varepsilon + \eta(1 + \operatorname{diam} D).$$

Since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\delta_{2N}(A) < \varepsilon$. □

Remark 2.3. *We are thankful to an anonymous referee for pointing out to us that Lemma 2.2 can be obtained as a corollary of the so-called "Superlemma" of Namioka and Bourgain* [3, Chapter IX, p. 157]. *Indeed, under the assumption* (2) *we can apply this result to the closed convex hull of D to obtain a slice $S = S(D, x_0^*, \delta)$ of D with diameter smaller than the diameter of $\overline{\operatorname{co}}(D_m)$, which is less than 2ε. Taking $d_0 \in S(D, x_0^*, \delta/2)$ we can argue as in the last part of the proof of Lemma 2.2 to conclude the result.*

Lemma 2.4. *Let $F \subset X$ be a finite-dimensional subspace and $D \subset X$ bounded. If $\alpha(D) > \lambda > 0$, then there exists $x_0^* \in S_{F^\perp}$ such that* $\sup(x_0^*, D) > \lambda$.

Proof. Suppose that every $x_0^* \in S_{F^\perp}$ satisfies that $\sup(x_0^*, D) \leq \lambda$. By Hahn-Banach Theorem we have that $D \subset F + \lambda B_X$. But then $D \subset \mu B_F + \lambda B_X$ for some $\mu > 0$, which implies that $\alpha(D) \leq \lambda$ by the compactness of B_F. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let $A \subset X$ be bounded. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in* $\operatorname{aco}(A)$ *such that*

$$(\delta_{2^N}(A) - \varepsilon) \cdot \max_{1\leq n\leq N} |\lambda_n| \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n x_n \right\| \leq \delta_0(A) \cdot \max_{1\leq n\leq N} |\lambda_n| \tag{4}$$

for every $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Write $\eta = \varepsilon/3$. Fix $x_0 \in A_0 := A$ and put $A_1 := (A - x_0) \cap (x_0 - A)$. By Lemma 2.2 we have that $\alpha(A_1) > \delta_2(A) - \eta$, so Lemma 2.4 yields that there are $x_1 \in A_1$ and $x_1^* \in S_{X^*}$ with $x_1^*(x_1) > \sup(x_1^*, A_1) - \eta > \delta_2(A) - 2\eta$. Suppose that $N \geq 1$ and we have constructed $(x_n^*)_{n=1}^N$ in S_{X^*}, $(x_n)_{n=1}^N$ in $\operatorname{aco}(A)$ and $(A_n)_{n=1}^N$ subsets of X satisfying for each $1 \leq n \leq N$:

(a) $x_{n-1} \pm A_n \subset A_{n-1}$ and $A_n \in \Delta_{2^{n-1}}(A)$.
(b) $\{x_k : 1 \leq k < n\} \subset \ker x_n^*$.
(c) $x_n^*(x_n) > \sup(x_n^*, A_n) - \eta > \delta_{2^n}(A) - 2\eta$.

Put $A_{N+1} := (A_N - x_N) \cap (x_N - A_N) \in \Delta_{2^N}(A)$. By Lemma 2.2 we have that $\alpha(A_{N+1}) > \delta_{2^{N+1}}(A) - \eta_{N+1}$, so using Lemma 2.4 we obtain $x_{N+1} \in A_{N+1}$ and $x_{N+1}^* \in S_{X^*}$ such that $\{x_k : 1 \leq k \leq N\} \subset \ker x_{N+1}^*$ and $x_{N+1}^*(x_{N+1}) > \sup(x_{N+1}^*, A_{N+1}) - \eta > \delta_{2^{N+1}}(A) - 2\eta$. This finishes the inductive construction. Notice that conditions (a) and (c) imply that

(d) $|x_n^*(z)| < \eta$ whenever $z \in A_{n+1}$.

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we show now that the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (4). For every $0 \neq (\lambda_n)_{n=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we can write

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n x_n \right\| = |\lambda_m| \cdot \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_m} x_n \right\| \leq |\lambda_m| \cdot \delta_0(A)$$

being m such that $|\lambda_m| = \max\{|\lambda_n| : 1 \leq n \leq N\}$, since $x_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N \pm x_n \in A$. Furthermore

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_m} x_n \right\| \geq \langle x_m^*, x_m \rangle + \langle x_m^*, \sum_{m<n\leq N} \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_m} x_n \rangle \geq \delta_{2^m}(A) - 3\eta \geq \delta_{2^N}(A) - 3\eta,$$

where we have used (b), (c), (d) and the fact that

$$\sum_{m<n\leq N} \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_m} x_n \in \operatorname{co}(A_{m+1}), \text{ which is a consequence of (a).}$$

□

Corollary 2.6. *Let $A \subset X$ be bounded. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence in $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in* $\operatorname{aco}(A)$ *such that*

$$(\delta_\infty(A) - \varepsilon) \max_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n| \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda_n x_n \right\| \leq \delta_0(A) \cdot \max_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|$$

for every finitely supported sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}$.

3. Copies of c_0 in Banach spaces

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a Banach space. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *c_0 is not isomorphic to a subspace of X.*
(ii) *$\delta_\infty(C) = 0$ for every bounded set $C \subset X$.*
(iii) *$\delta_\infty(C) = 0$ for every bounded, convex and closed set $C \subset X$.*

Proof. Implication (i)⇒(ii) is a consequence of Corollary 2.6, while (ii)⇒(iii) is obvious. We just have to check that (iii)⇒(i). Let $T : c_0 \to X$ be an isomorphism, and consider $A := T(B_{c_0})$. Given $a_1, \ldots, a_N \in A$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we can find $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_n \pm (1-\varepsilon)T(e_m) \in A$ for every $1 \leq n \leq N$. This shows that $\delta_N(A) \geq (1-\varepsilon)/\|T^{-1}\|$ for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$. □

When c_0 is isomorphic to a subspace of X, it is also said that X has a copy of c_0. It turns out that these spaces have indeed almost isometric copies of c_0, which means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find a closed subspace $Y \subset X$ and an isomorphism $T : c_0 \to Y$ such that $\|T\|\|T^{-1}\| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.

Theorem 3.2 (James)**.** *If X has a copy of c_0, then it has almost isometric copies of c_0.*

Proof. If c_0 embedds into X then there exists a bounded set $A \subset X$ with $\delta_\infty(A) > 0$ by Theorem 3.1. It follows from the definition of $\delta_\infty(A)$ that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an element $D \in \bigcup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} \Delta_N(A)$ such that

$$\delta_\infty(A) \leq \delta_0(D) \leq (1+\varepsilon)\delta_\infty(A).$$

Since $\delta_\infty(A) \leq \delta_\infty(D)$, we deduce that $\delta_0(D) \leq (1+\varepsilon)\delta_\infty(D)$, so an application of Corollary 2.6 with D leads to the desired copy of c_0. □

Another easy consequence is the Bessaga-Pełzcynski criterion for the existence of copies of c_0. Recall that a series $\sum_n x_n$ in a Banach space X is said to be wuC if $\sum_n |x^*(x_n)|$ converges for every $x^* \in X^*$, which by the Uniform Boundedness Principle implies that $\sum_n |x^*(x_n)|$ is uniformly bounded for $x^* \in B_{X^*}$.

Theorem 3.3 (Bessaga-Pełczynski)**.** *If $c_0 \nsubseteq X$ and $\sum_n x_n$ is wuC, then the series is unconditionally convergent.*

Proof. Consider the uniformly bounded sets given by

$$A_m = \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{m} \theta_n x_n : \theta_n \in \{-1,1\} \text{ for each } 1 \leq n \leq m \right\}, \quad A = \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} A_m.$$

If X does not contain a copy of c_0, then $\delta_\infty(A) = 0$, so given $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $a_1, \ldots, a_N \in A$ with

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{N} (A - a_j) \cap (a_j - A) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

There is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{a_n : 1 \leq n \leq N\} \subset \bigcup_{m\leq M} A_m$, so $\left\| \sum_{n=M}^{M'} \theta_n x_n \right\| \leq \varepsilon$ for every $\theta_n \in \{-1,1\}$ and $M' \geq M$. □

We finish with a non-symmetrized characterization of Banach spaces with no copies of c_0.

Proposition 3.4. *A Banach space X does not contain an isomorphic copy of c_0 if and only if for every bounded set $A \subset X$ and each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in A$ such that*

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{N} (A - x_j) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. The sufficiency of the condition is consequence of Theorem 3.1. To see the converse, assume that there exists $A \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that any intersection like in the statement has diameter greater or equal than ε. Fix an arbitrary $x_0 \in A$ and then pick $x_1 \in (A - x_0)$ such that $\|x_1\| \geq \varepsilon$. Consider the set $A_1 := \{x_0, x_0 + x_1\} \subset A$. Now we take

$$x_2 \in \bigcap_{x\in A_1} (A - x) \text{ with } \|x_2\| \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 := A_1 \cup (A_1 + x_2).$$

Following in this way, we will have a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of vectors of norm greater or equal to ε for $n \geq 1$ and sets $A_n \subset A$ of cardinality 2^n. Then consider

$$x_{n+1} \in \bigcap_{x\in A_n} (A - x) \text{ with } \|x_{n+1}\| \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad A_{n+1} := A_n \cup (x_n + A_n).$$

Notice that the sums $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \theta_n x_n$ are uniformly bounded independently of N and the choice of $\theta_n \in \{-1,1\}$, since they are difference of two elements of $A_N \subset A$. Now Theorem 3.3 implies that X contains a copy of c_0. □

4. REMARKS

Let A be a subset of X. Recall that an ε-tree in A is a a sequence $\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $x_n = (x_{2n} + x_{2n+1})/2$ and $\|x_{2n} - x_{2n+1}\| \geq \varepsilon$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The index $\delta_1(A)$ is directly related to existence of ε-trees inside A. In fact, if $\delta_1(A) > \varepsilon$, then we can construct a 2ε-tree inside of A in the following way: fix any $x_1 \in A$. Since $\operatorname{diam}((A - x_1) \cap (x_1 - A)) > 2\varepsilon$, we can find $u_1 \in X$ such that $\|u_1\| \geq \varepsilon$ and $x_1 \pm u_1 \in A$. Put $x_2 := x_1 - u_1$ and $x_3 := x_1 + u_1$. Repeating this process with x_2, x_3 and the subsequent constructed points, we obtain the desired 2ε-tree. On the other hand, it is clear that every ε-tree A' satisfies that $\delta_1(A') \geq \varepsilon/2$. As a consequence, we can conclude that a set $A \subset X$ contains no ε-trees (for any $\varepsilon > 0$) if and only if $\delta_1(A') = 0$ for each $A' \subset A$. In particular, if C is a closed and convex set having the Radon-Nikodým Property (RNP), then $\delta_1(A) = 0$ for every $A \subset C$.

We say that $x_0 \in A$ is an *ε-extreme point* of A if $\operatorname{diam}((A - x_0) \cap (x_0 - A))$ is less than 2ε. It is not difficult to see that x_0 is an extreme point of A if and only if it is ε-extreme for every $\varepsilon > 0$. As a consequence, if $K \subset X$ is a bounded, closed and convex set having the Krein-Milman Property (KMP), then $\delta_1(C) = 0$ for every closed and convex set $C \subset K$.

The previous notion reminds of the following concept introduced by Kunen and Rosenthal [6]: $x_0 \in A$ is an *ε-strong extreme point* of A if there is $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $a_1, a_2 \in A$ and there exists a point $u = \lambda a_1 + (1 - \lambda) a_2$ $(0 < \lambda < 1)$ with $\|x_0 - u\| < \delta$, then $\|u - a_1\| < \varepsilon$ or $\|u - a_2\| < \varepsilon$. If x_0 is ε-strong extreme for every $\varepsilon > 0$, then we simply say that it is a *strong extreme point*. It is not difficult to see that every ε-strong extreme point of A is an ε-extreme point of the same set. The converse is not true, since as it is pointed out in [6, Remark 3, p. 173] every strong extreme point of a bounded, closed and convex set is also an extreme point of its $\sigma(X^{**}, X^*)$-closure (in the terminology of [4] we might say that these are *preserved extreme points*), while there are, for instance, Banach spaces where B_X has extreme points that are not extreme points of $B_{X^{**}}$ (see [4]). With this formulation we have that if K is a bounded, closed and convex set such that every $A \subset K$ has ε-extreme points for every $\varepsilon > 0$ (i.e. $\delta_1(A) = 0$), then each closed and convex set $C \subset K$ has an ε-strong extreme point for every $\varepsilon > 0$ (see [6, Proposition 3.2, p. 170]).

REFERENCES

[1] BOURGAIN, J. *La proprieté de Radon-Nikodým*. Publ. Math. de l'Univ. Pierre et Marie Curie, (36) (1979).

[2] BOURGIN, D. *Geometric aspects of convex sets with the Radon-Nikodým property*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 993, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1983).

[3] DIESTEL, J. *Sequences and series in Banach spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Vol. 92 (1984).

[4] GUIRAO, A. J., MONTESINOS, V., AND ZIZLER, V. . *On Preserved and Unpreserved Extreme Points. In Descriptive Topology and Functional Analysis* (pp. 163-193). Springer International Publishing (2014).

[5] FABIAN, M., HABALA, P., HÁJEK, P., MONTESINOS, V., AND ZIZLER, V. *Banach space theory: the basis for linear and nonlinear analysis*. Springer Science and Business Media, (2011).

[6] KUNEN, K., AND ROSENTHAL, H., *Martingale proofs of some geometrical results in Banach space theory*. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 100(1), 153-175 (1982).

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, 30100 ESPINARDO (MURCIA), SPAIN
E-mail address: antonio.perez7@um.es

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, 30100 ESPINARDO (MURCIA), SPAIN
E-mail address: matias@um.es